

Case 8:22-cv-01300-JWH-KES Document 63 Filed 01/23/25 Page 2 of 4 Page ID #:2872

SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE COMPANY, an Ohio insurance company,

Counterdefendant.

24

 Pursuant to the "Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 49] and Denying Counterclaimant's Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 50]" entered on or about January 21, 2025, and in accordance with Rules 56 and 58(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,

It is hereby **ORDERED**, **ADJUDGED**, and **DECREED** as follows:

- 1. This Court possesses subject matter jurisdiction over the above-captioned action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
 - 2. The operative pleadings in this case are as follows:
 - a. the Complaint [ECF No. 1] filed by Plaintiff Scottsdale Insurance Company ("Scottsdale");
 - b. the Counterclaim [ECF No. 36] filed by Counterclaimant Richard Marshack, in his capacity as Chapter 7 Trustee and Assignee of Claims from Beachcomber at Crystal Cove, LLC, a California limited liability company, and Shake Shack Crystal Cove, LLC, a California limited liability company (the "Trustee");
- 3. Defendant Ralph Kosmides was **DISMISSED with prejudice** on or about September 27, 2022.
- 4. Defendant Beachcomber Management Crystal Cove, LLC was **DISMISSED with prejudice** on or about November 11, 2022.
- 5. Defendant Douglas Cavanaugh was **DISMISSED with prejudice** on or about November 11, 2022.
- 6. On or about December 28, 2022, the Trustee was granted leave to intervene in his capacity as Chapter 7 Trustee for non-party Ruby's Diner, Inc. and as the assignee of the claims of Defendants Beachcomber at Crystal Cove, LLC and Shake Shack Crystal Cove, LLC.
- 7. Judgment is hereby **ENTERED** in **FAVOR** of Scottsdale, and **AGAINST** the Trustee, on Count I of the Complaint. The Court hereby **DECLARES** that the "Prior Notice Exclusion" contained in the insurance

- 8. Judgment is hereby **ENTERED** in **FAVOR** of Scottsdale, and **AGAINST** the Trustee, on Count II of the Complaint. The Court hereby **DECLARES** that the Underlying Action does not constitute a "Claim" that was first made during the policy period of the Scottsdale Policy, and, as a result, the Underlying Action does not fall within the scope of coverage of the Scottsdale Policy, and, therefore, Scottsdale has no duty to defend or indemnify the Insureds under the Scottsdale Policy in connection with the Underlying Action.
- Scottsdale has voluntarily **DISMISSED** Count III of the Complaint.
- 10. Judgment is hereby **ENTERED** in **FAVOR** of Scottsdale, and **AGAINST** the Trustee, on Count I of the Counterclaim. That claim for relief is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.
- 11. Judgment is hereby **ENTERED** in **FAVOR** of Scottsdale, and **AGAINST** the Trustee, on Count II of the Counterclaim. That claim for relief is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.
- 12. Other than potential post-judgment remedies (including those provided in Rule 54(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure), to the extent that any party requests any other form of relief, such request is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 23, 2025

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE